

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/511,146	10/14/2004	Masami Kujirai	2004-1547A	1988	
513 WENDEROTE	7590 12/20/2006 I, LIND & PONACK, L.L	"P.	EXAM	INER	
2033 K STREET N. W.			MOORE, MARGARET G		
SUITE 800 WASHINGTO	N, DC 20006-1021		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	,		1712		
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVER	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MO	NTUS	12/20/2006	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

				/
		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
		10/511,146	KUJIRAI, MASAMI	
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
		Margaret G. Moore	1712	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with	h the correspondence address -	
WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Depriod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailir ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC 136(a). In no event, however, may a re- will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT e, cause the application to become ABA	ATION.  Oly be timely filed  HS from the mailing date of this communication  NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status				
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on			
· —	•	s action is non-final.		
/	Since this application is in condition for allowe		rs, prosecution as to the merits	s is
	closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D.	11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Dispositi	ion of Claims			
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1 to 20 is/are pending in the applicat	ion.		
•	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra			
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠	Claim(s) 1 to 20 is/are rejected.			•
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8)□	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.		
Applicati	on Papers			
9)□	The specification is objected to by the Examin	er.		
	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ acc		y the Examiner.	
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	e drawing(s) be held in abeyand	e. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	ction is required if the drawing(s	) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.12	!1(d).
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	xaminer. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-152	2.
Priority u	under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
_	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreigr ☑ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	n priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).	
	1. Certified copies of the priority documen	ts have been received.		
	2. Certified copies of the priority documen	ts have been received in Ap	plication No	
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the price	ority documents have been r	eceived in this National Stage	
	application from the International Burea	, ,,		
* 8	See the attached detailed Office action for a list	t of the certified copies not r	eceived.	
Attachmen		,, <del>(</del>	(DTO	
	e of References Cited (PTO-892) te of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Su Paper No(s)	mmary (PTO-413) /Mail Date	
3) 🛛 Infor	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date		ormal Patent Application	

Application/Control Number: 10/511,146 Page 2

Art Unit: 1712

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1 to 6, 8 to 14 and 17 to 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Angeline.

Angeline teaches an aqueous silane coupling agent used to coat glass. Please see Table 1 on column 8. This shows a composition containing a silane coupling agent in an amount as claimed. This coupling agent meets the requirement of claim 2. The composition also contains a surfactant in an amount meeting claim 3. It is applied to glass. This differs from the claims in that Angeline does not specifically teach a total anion content.

To this extent, the Examiner tried to determine what an typical or an expected anion content of CaCO<sub>3</sub> is in deionized water. It appears that 700 mg/L of CaCO<sub>3</sub> (which corresponds to 14,000 ppm<sup>1</sup>) is well within the range of conventional or typical amounts of CaCO<sub>3</sub> for deionized water.

To support the Examiner's position of what is conventional or typical in the art, the Examiner refers to several references that teach deionized water and establishes a what can be considered to be a conventional amount. See 1) 5,250,185, Table 1, 2) 6,537,456, Table 1, 3) 5,811,012, Table 1, 4) 5,518,627, column 20, line 65 and 5) 6,929,748, Table 1. These references all teach deionized water having a calcium content significantly lower than the upper limit claimed. From this the skilled artisan

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> See 4,658,059, column 9, lines 15 to 17, which teaches this conversion.

Application/Control Number: 10/511,146 Page 3

Art Unit: 1712

would have expected that the deionized water used in Angeline to inherently meet the requirement claimed. In this manner the composition in Angeline anticipates the instant claims.

On the other hand, one having ordinary skill in the art would have found the use of deionized water having a CaCO<sub>3</sub> content of less than 700 mg/L to have been obvious in view of the fact that many deionized waters have CaCO<sub>3</sub> contents within this range. In this manner the instant claims are rendered obvious.

The Examiner notes that applicants believe that a CaCO<sub>3</sub> content of greater than 700 mg/L will result in gelation (see the working examples in the specification). Please note that the composition of Angeline does not gel.

For the limitations found in claims 5 and 6, please note that products of identical chemical composition can not have mutually exclusive properties. A chemical composition and its properties are inseparable. Therefore, if the prior art teaches the identical chemical structure, the properties applicant discloses and/or claims are necessarily present. For the limitation found in claim 19 note that the composition of Angeline is applied to the outer surface of a glass windshield.

4. Claims 7, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Angeline.

The prior art fails to specifically teach a thickness for the coating composition but column 8, line 12, teaches that the coating is a thin layer. One having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to adjust the thickness of the composition in Angeline in an effort to determine what is an optimum or operable "thin" layer. In this manner the skilled artisan would have found this claim limitation obvious.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Margaret G. Moore whose telephone number is 571-272-1090. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Wednesday and Friday, 10am to 4pm.

Application/Control Number: 10/511,146 Page 4

Art Unit: 1712

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Randy Gulakowski can be reached on (571) 272-1302. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571/272-1000.

Margaret G. Moore Primary Examiner Art Unit 1712

mgm 12/15/06